UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/796,048	03/10/2004	Hideki Kamada	249171US0	2720	
22850 7590 08/17/2010 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER		
			STEELE, JENNIFER A		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1782		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/17/2010	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/796,048	KAMADA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JENNIFER STEELE	1782		

	JENNIFER STEELE	1782					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>02 August 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI 1. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request				
periods: a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any externotice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 2.3.5-7.9-11.13-15.17-19.23.27.28.30 a Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 5-8 and 13-16.	rided below or appended.	l be entered and an e	xplanation of				
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Shoot 		•					
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Rena L. Dye/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1782	/J. S./ Examiner, Art Unit 1782						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The claims were not amended and therefore are entered. Applicants arguments are persuasive in showing that the flat fiber of the invention is flatter and therefore different from the flat fiber of Toray. However Applicant introduces evidence and information that is not part of the original disclosure and not claimed. Applicant states that the process of making the fiber is a solidification phase separation method, however Applicant's specification teaches the method for producing the PVA fibers is not specifically defined and the fibers may be produced in any mode of dry spinning, wet spinning or wet-jet-wet spinning (page 6). It is not clear that the solification phase separation method is the same as the dry or wet spinning processes described in the specification. As the evidence submitted in the arguments is not supported in the specification, the evidence should be in the form of a 1.132 declaration.